

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 22, 2007. Claims 6, 35, and 38 have been amended, claims 1-5 and 17-34 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 43-59 have been added. Claims 6-16 and 35-59 are presently pending. No new matter has been added.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted with the Applicant's representative, Bruce Black, on March 22, 2007. The rejection of the claims over Carr and Allport was discussed.

§103 Rejections

Claims 6-8, 10, 11, 13, and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,051,357 to Carr ("Carr") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,441 to Allport ("Allport"). Claims 9, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Allport further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,018,768 to Ullman et al. ("Ullman"). Claims 15, 16 and 38-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Allport and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,221 to Banker et al. ("Banker"). The Applicant traverses these rejections.

The Office Action appears to misunderstand the amendment from the preceding Response by viewing "television programs" and "trigger information" as a single term (e.g., in line 13 of claim 6 in the preceding Response). These terms were intended to be separate and should be read in that manner. To assist in clarification, the present independent claims 6, 31, and 35 have been amended and new independent claims 43, 52, and 55 have been added. This amendment is not intended to be narrowing but is to clarify the subject matter of the claims and to address any misunderstanding regarding the claim language.

Independent claims 6, 35, and 38 recite "wherein the interactive video casting system is configured and arranged to allow the user to individually identify as a user preference one or more television channels, from the plurality of television channels, for which trigger information will be

provided to a remote device for storage on the remote device." Claims 43, 52, and 55 are similar except that instead of television channels, television programs are individually identifiable as a user preference. In other words, the interactive video casting system allows the user to individually identify, as a user preference, which television channels, or television programs, will have trigger information stored on the remote device. This allows the user to personalize the stored information and also can assist in assigning memory resources on the remote device to information in which the user is interested.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests this feature. Carr discloses providing ancillary information for all of the television channels to a receiver. Allport discloses providing embedded data to a remote control. None of the references, alone or in combination, discuss allowing the user to individually select those television channels, or television programs, for which trigger information will be stored on a remote device. A teaching of this type of user selectivity is absent from the cited references.

Thus, the cited references fail to teach or suggest every claim element. For at least these reasons, claims 6, 35, 38, 43, 52, and 55, as well as the remainder of the pending claims which depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

